

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

By this amendment, claims 1-26 are pending, claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 14, 22, 24 and 26 having been amended.

Rejection of Claims 1, 5 and 9-19

On page 3 of the Final Office Action of June 26, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 5 and 9-19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,418,411 to Gong in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,864,810 to Digalakis et al. (“Digalakis”) and further in view of U.S Patent No. 6,289,309 to DeVries. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Amended independent claim 1 is directed to a method of dynamic re-configurable speech recognition. The method includes, among other things, applying one of a plurality of language models to a received voice request for speech recognition based on a data field selected by a speaker.

Applicants submit that Gong, Digalakis and DeVries fail to disclose or suggest, either separately or in any combination, applying one of a plurality of language models to a received voice request for speech recognition based on a data field selected by a speaker, as required by amended claim 1. Gong, Digalakis and DeVries are completely silent with respect to any relationship between a data field selected by a speaker and a language model applied to a received voice request for speech recognition.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn. Claims 2-4 and 15 depend from claim 1 and are patentable over Gong, Digalakis and DeVries for at least the reasons discussed with respect

to claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 2-4 and 15 be withdrawn.

Amended independent claim 5 is directed to a system for dynamic re-configurable speech recognition. The system includes, among other things, a speech recognition circuit for recognizing speech and generating a speech lattice for each of a plurality of data fields for which a user provides voice input, wherein the speech recognition circuit is arranged to use a different language model for each of the plurality of data fields.

Applicants submit that the above-discussed feature of claim 5 is similar to the previously-discussed feature of claim 1 and is patentable over Gong, Digalakis and DeVries for reasons similar to those provided with respect to claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the rejection of claim 5 be withdrawn. Claim 16 depends from claim 5 and is patentable for at least the reasons discussed with respect to claim 5. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 16 be withdrawn.

Amended independent claims 9, 13 and 14 has features similar to those of claim 1 and are patentable over Gong, Digalakis and DeVries for at least the reasons discussed with respect to claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 9, 13 and 14 be withdrawn. Claims 10-12 and 17-19 depend from one of claims 9, 13, or 14 and are patentable over Gong, Digalakis and DeVries for at least the reasons discussed with respect to claims 9, 13, or 14. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 10-12 and 17-19 be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 22, 24 and 26

On page 11 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 22, 24 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Gong, in view of Digalakis and DeVries, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,078,886 to Dragosh et al. (“Dragosh”). Applicants

respectfully traverse the rejection. Claims 22, 24 and 26 were amended only to conform each of the claims with their respective independent claim.

Claims 22, 24 and 26 depends from claims 1, 5 and 14 respectively. Applicants submit that claims 22, 24 and 26 are patentable over Gong, Digalakis and DeVries for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1, 5 and 14, respectively. Applicants submit that Dragosh fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Gong, Digalakis and DeVries. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 22, 24 and 26 be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 2, 4, 6, 8 and 20

On page 12 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 2, 4, 6, 8, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Gong, Digalakis, DeVries, and further in view of published U.S. Patent Application 2002/00052742 to Thrasher et al. (Thrasher). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 2, 4, 6, 8 and 20 depend from one of claims 1, 5, 9, or 14 and are patentable over Gong, Digalakis and DeVries for at least the reasons discussed with respect to claims 1, 5, 9, or 14. Applicants submit that Thrasher fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Gong, Digalakis and DeVries. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 2, 4, 6, 8 and 20 be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 3 and 7

On page 15 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 3 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Gong, Digalakis, DeVries, Thrasher, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,712,957 to Waibel et al. (Waibel). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 3 and 7 depend from claims 1 and 5, respectively. Applicants submit that claims 3 and 7 are patentable over Gong, Digalakis and DeVries for at least the reasons discussed above respect to claims 1 and 5. Applicants submit that Thrasher and Waibel fail to satisfy the deficiencies of Gong, Digalakis and DeVries. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 3 and 7 be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 21, 23 and 25

On page 16 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 21, 23 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Gong, Digalakis, DeVries, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,107,935 to Comerford et al. (Comerford). Applicants submit that amended claims 1, 5 and 14 obviate the rejection.

Claims 21, 23 and 25 depend from claims 1, 5 and 14, respectively. Applicants submit that claims 21, 23 and 25 are patentable over Gong, Digalakis and DeVries for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1, 5 and 14, respectively. Applicants submit that Comerford fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Gong, Digalakis and DeVries. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims will 21, 23 and 25 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Having addressed all rejections, Applicants respectfully submit that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 25, 2006

By: /Richard C. Irving/

Correspondence Address:

Customer No. 49637
AT&T Corp.
Room 2A-207
One AT&T Way
Bedminster, NJ 07921

Richard C. Irving
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 38,499
Phone: 410-286-9405
Fax No.: 410-510-1433